



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,368	07/05/2004	Scott Thompson	53797.23	4367

22828 7590 05/16/2006

EDWARD YOO C/O BENNETT JONES
1000 ATCO CENTRE
10035 - 105 STREET
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, AB T5J3T2
CANADA

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2831

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/710,368

Applicant(s)

THOMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

Chau N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blaisdell (3.204,332).

Blaisdell discloses (Figures 1-5) an electrical conducting cable consisting essentially of: (a) a conductive core (col. 1, lines 66-72) having terminal lugs at each end; and (b) a gas impermeable sheath which is hermetically sealed to each of the terminal lugs (re claim 6). Blaisdell also discloses that the sheath is flexible and comprises a corrugated metal resistant to oxidation (re claim 9) and the corrugated metal comprises a stainless steel (re claim 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaisdell.

Claims 7 and 8 additionally recite the conductive core comprising copper. Although not specifically disclosed by Blaisdell, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use copper for the conductive core of Blaisdell since copper is well-known in the art for being used as conductive core because of its highly conductivity.

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaisdell in view of Barton (2,987,329).

Blaisdell discloses (Figure 5) a single electrical conducting cable comprising: (a) a conductive core having solid terminal lugs at each end, wherein said lugs comprise an oxidation resistant alloy; and (b) a gas impermeable sheath comprising an oxidation resistant alloy which is hermetically sealed using a heat resistant braze to each of the terminal lugs, thereby entirely encasing the conductive core.

Blaisdell does not disclose the terminal lugs being one-piece (the terminal lug of Blaisdell comprising two parts 17 and 27, see Figure 5). Barton discloses a terminal lug (10, Figure 3) which is a solid one-piece terminal lug. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the terminal lugs of Blaisdell to be one-piece terminal lugs, part 17 and 27 being integrally formed, as taught by Barton to simplify the process of terminating the cable and since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Larson* 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349.

The modified cable of Blaisdell also discloses the sheath being flexible and comprising a corrugated stainless steel (re claims 4 and 5). Re claims 2 and 3, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use copper for the conductive core of Blaisdell since copper is well-known in the art for being used as conductive core because of its highly conductivity.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831